

the same reason; because, I doubt not, the representatives from some of the indebted State advocate it because they want the means to pay off these debts. But those leading members of the opposite party who understand the objects of that party, and who are bold and frank enough to avow them, tell you that it is that they may secure more benefit under a tariff, and have greater certainty of a continuance of a high one. They advocate the policy of giving away the money you have from a permanent branch of revenue, and costing nothing, for the sake of an opportunity to tax you more for the current expenses of government—in a word, to pursue the system of blessings, by taxation on the people to the extent of some two millions.—Can this be wise? Can it be politic? Can it be equal or just? For I have shown you that of all the great interests of the country, you can directly benefit but few; and that the only compensation you can give to others, is by so wielding the power as to fill the treasury, and relieve them from taxation in another mode.

Another policy (said Mr W.), deserves notice—though I do not mean to charge its opponents as a party. It is the proposition to assume on the federal treasury two hundred millions of the debts of the indebted States of this Union. I do not speak from mere conjecture. The proposition was made by a committee of the last Congress, at the head of which was a prominent member of the whig party from Maryland, and was pressed on Congress in an elaborate report of 500 pages.—Leading journals of that party have followed it up, and within two weeks, a prominent man of the other party, in addressing such a meeting as this, pressed it as one of the wisest measures, and urged its adoption. I do not believe that the whig party recognize it as a part of their policy; but does it not belong to their family of measures? If you are to have a bank, a prohibitory tariff, distribution, and all that—a great debt is indispensable to protect the mechanic and make it work smoothly. [Laughter.] That has been the main spine in the British wheel, without which the machine could not work. But I am detaining you too long, and will give you in a few moments. [Cries of "Go on!"]

I cannot but call your attention to the fact, and to ask you candidly to say if it be not true, that there is a broad distinction in the general course of the two political parties and of their men who address you pending our elections; in reference to the policy they propose? And are not our opponents exceedingly apt, as in this instance of the tariff, to promise to us most liberally, most generously—and if performance followed, we might say, most prophetically. [Laughter.] In this case their system of promises—and they will not feel that I do them injustice, when I say so—is at least liberal and flattering.—But when we remember the charges they made against us four years ago, and the promises with which they besetted those charges, can we have entire confidence that another class of promises may not have equally unfortunate results? [Laughter.] They told us we were going to ruin the country by extravagance in public expenditures. They came into power and increased those expenditures. They said we had plunged the country irretrievably into debt. They came in and showed that we had made a debt of five and a half millions, which in three years they made twenty-five millions and a half. They told us that we had carried political proscription to great lengths—that we were destroying the liberty of thought, of speech, and of the press, by driving from office every man who ventured to express political opinions adverse to those of the ruling power. They came into office, and in three-quarters of a year, removed more than double as many for political cause, as the democratic administrations of the twelve preceding years had removed. They said the government had become rotten—dangerously, ruinously rotten, by the appointment of members of Congress to office—and in three years, their administration appointed more members of Congress to office, than had been appointed in any eight years of any democratic administration. They promised us on all these points speedy retrenchment, reform and correction. They have deceived themselves. May they not deceive themselves and us again if we trust them in regard to the prosperity which they promise will result from a prohibitory tariff?

One word as to the Presidency—for those and other topics will be discussed more fully by those who will succeed me. Of Mr Clay, whom I have known many years and well, I have no word to say, on this occasion but that he is the proper representative of the principles and policy of the party whose candidate he is. [Laughter.]

They want a Bank.—He is for a Bank. They desire to distribute the proceeds of the public lands. That is an essential part of his policy. And so on to the end of the enumeration. But our opponents sometimes ask us, who is this James K. Polk who have made your candidate? That question is most rapidly being answered, and indeed now is very seldom asked among us. But permit me to say, that my personal acquaintance with that gentleman, commenced in 1827, when I first had the honor to take a seat in the congress of the United States, from the free and generous votes of the democracy of Jefferson and Oswego, and Lewis and St Lawrence, who if they had been then fair-weather politicians—as they have shown to-day they are not—I should never have enjoyed that honor. He was then a prominent member of the House of Representatives from Tennessee: Very soon in that body, which should at least collect a respectable portion of the talent of the Union, he passed to the head of the committee of ways and means—the most responsible committee of that responsible body. In a few years he was elevated to the Speaker's chair, where he presided for four years—following a man there, a man of all the talents, character and fame of even Mr Clay himself. During all this period, Gov. Polk was the confidential friend, the stern and unbending advocate of the measures, and policy of Presidents Jackson and Van Buren. For twelve or thirteen years he was as faithful to democratic measures and principles as any man who represented any section of the country. He was called from thence, to take the highest office in

his state. If not as much known as many men in our country, he has not thrown himself forward, nor have his friends been very free to throw his name forward, when offices were to be distributed. But does he, under this successful trial, the less deserve our confidence and our warm and united support? [Cheers.]

There is another subject on which I feel bound to speak a word—a question which sprung up during the last session of congress. I allude to the proposition to annex Texas to the territory of this Republic. I was called on officially to act on that great national proposition. It is not my purpose to discuss the matter before you, because one who is to follow me, and who has paid more attention to the subject than I have, will do it amply justice. But to you I am bound to account for my official action on that great question. I felt it my duty to vote as a senator, and did vote, against the ratification of the Treaty for the annexation. It had been supposed by some, that I gave that vote from an unyielding opinion that annexation should never take place. That is not so. I have made up no such opinion. For the treaty I could not vote, and one of the reasons was that I believed then, as now, if we propose to take that country into our confederacy, at the time under the then existing relations between Mexico and Texas, it was our duty as one of the civilized nations of the earth, to go frankly, honestly, openly, to Mexico, and avow our wishes and designs—to offer to negotiate with her in reference to any claim she might have, and to make to her character, honor and interest all proper and honorable tenders. I believe the honor, the faith and standing of this Union imperiously demanded this course. Again, I believed that the Treaty from the boundaries that must be implied from it, if Mexico would not treat with us embraced a country to which Texas had no claim—over which she had never asserted jurisdiction, and which she had no right to cede. On this point I should give you a brief explanation.

The treaty ceded Texas by name, without any effort to describe a boundary. The congress of Texas had passed an act declaring by metes and bounds what was Texas within their power and jurisdiction. It appeared to me then, if Mexico should tell us, 'we don't know you—we have no treaty to make with you'—and we were left to take possession by force, we must take the country as Texas had ceded it to us—and in doing that or forfeiting our own honor, we must do injustice to Mexico, and take a large portion of New-Mexico, the people of which have never been under the jurisdiction of Texas. This to me was an insupportable barrier. I could not place the country in that position. Again, the record sent with the treaty—the correspondence between our negotiators, and the Texas commissioners, and the British minister—was any thing but acceptable to me. That correspondence did not present the true reason why that country should be annexed to the Union, if it should be annexed. It was, as all recollect, put on the assumed ground that it was necessary to strengthen, defend and perpetuate the institution of slavery in the country. On this subject I speak with entire frankness. To say that I am not a friend to the institution of slavery as an individual, would be to offend you. For no man living here in our society, can in his heart cherish an institution of that sort as a matter of principle. It is a libel on man to suppose so. Yet the institution exists among us. It existed in our state when the federal constitution was formed. The convention of '87—the wisest body of men, unquestionably, that ever has assembled for civil purposes within the history of the world, made the compromises which enabled them to form the Union. Without it the Union would never have existed. What were they? To leave the existence, the measure and management of slavery exclusively to each state for itself. We, most wisely and gradually abolished it with us. Other states, whether from choice or compulsion it does not become me to say, have not advanced so rapidly. But there is not one provision in that sacred instrument, which I would less willingly disturb. It is to me as sacred as any of the others—and whilst I live, so far as my voice and action is concerned, the guardianship and disposition of it shall be left to those among whom it exists, without interference from me. God knows I consider it deep enough misfortune on them, and I am not disposed to increase the evil. Still when called on, if I ever am, to extend and strengthen the institution, by a measure affecting a country out of the Union, not in it, it is a different question, and I shall hesitate, that great question, which has no business to be connected with our party politics—had none at its introduction at Washington, legitimately in my judgment,—that such a question should first be placed before the intelligent freemen of the country, discussed before them, and decided by them.—There it is now. There I cheerfully let it rest. I do believe that in certain national points of view, the annexation of Texas would be important to the Union—that our southern border would be improved and strengthened—that our position would be strengthened and secured. It is a question which public opinion should pass upon, and their servants should obey that opinion and will. Candor requires, that I should go a step further. From the observation I have made—and I have endeavored to make it calmly, and without prejudice or bias—I believe there is a growing inclination among the people of this country to extend our border in that direction. And I have now little doubt that if we live in that quiet and prosperity which we hope for, but a few years will pass over until we shall see the Union indisputably and I believe peaceably and honorably embracing both Oregon Texas. As to the Oregon territory, I have no more doubt of our right to it, than I have that New-York is a part of this Union. I have therefore acted—uniformly acted—as your representative, in favor of putting an end to the common occupancy between us and England, and extending at once our power and jurisdiction over that country. It would not be offensive if her neighborhood on our northern border should be satisfactory—but I have no desire to extend it on our west or to turn it round on the south if she should reach over to Texas. It is on such grounds that we should think of

and discuss this great question of Annexation. And well do I believe that when any European power should be seen attempting to colonize there—to set up another power on that border to disturb our quiet—that there will be but one sentiment among the democratic party, and a large minority of the whig party—and that is that we have enough of this neighborhood. My opinion of our duty is, that it will be wisely discharged if we attend carefully and practically to all the great questions which so deeply concern the Union as it is. Let us secure them—secure the equality and perpetuity of our system of law and constitution for that portion of country over which the stars and stripes now unquestionably and rightfully float; and when we have done that, through the result of this contest, by putting our government in the hands of the patriotic men whose names wave over my head—["Polk and Dallas"]—then let us take Oregon, which is ours, and Texas, if we choose; on proper and honorable terms.

Mr W. here left the stand, under hearty and prolonged cheering.

# THE AGE.

WOODSTOCK, VERMONT.  
THURSDAY EVENING, SEPT. 26, 1844



FOR PRESIDENT,  
**JAMES K. POLK,**  
OF TENNESSEE.  
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
**GEORGE M. DALLAS,**  
OF PENNSYLVANIA.  
STATE ELECTORAL TICKET.  
AT LARGE,  
EDWARD D. BARBER,  
NEWELL KINSMAN.  
For the Districts,  
No. 1.—JONAS CLARK.  
" 2.—CHARLES G. EASTMAN.  
" 4.—DAVID P. NOYES.

## "ONCE MORE TO THE BREACH!" THE COON HUNTER—LAST NUMBERS!

Don't give it up so, boys! You fought well in September, and the enemy recoiled over a ruinous victory. But, November is coming—another battle is to be fought, and if well fought, Henry Clay will be defeated in Vermont! The tide is all in our favor. The coon forces are in dismay while the victorious legions of democracy fill the whole heavens with their exultant shouts.

## ONCE MORE, BOYS OF VERMONT, UP AND AT 'EM!

We will send the remaining numbers of the Coon Hunter, from No. 10 to No. 18, inclusive, at the rate of TWELVE COPIES FOR ONE DOLLAR!

We never do anything in Vermont, at the Presidential election. Let us do something this year, and not allow the coons to crawl all over us, as we usually do.

Send in for the Coon Hunter—forthwith. It will skin the coons just about right.

## AS USUAL, If we live, we shall be at Montpelier,

during the session of the Legislature. It will afford us great pleasure to pay what little we may be owing our subscribers, as we know, it is only by means of that little they are able to print a paper for us.

## MIND NOW!

We take all kinds of produce in payment for the Age, and it is now just the time for the farmers to pay us for their subscriptions. Some of you, gentlemen, are a little hard with us. You take our paper year in and year out, and pay us nothing at all. You would think it rather hard if we should buy four or five bushels of corn of you every year for four years, and pay you in offering to take five more for the fifth year! That is precisely the way you serve us. Come now, be decent, and bring us something in payment for your paper. We will take anything but coon skins—they are worthless about these days.

## MIND NOW!

The Boston Atlas, talks about electing Chandler, coon, in Dillingham's district, at the next trial. According to a coon paper which we happen to have before us Chandler lacks 2,189 of an election, while Dillingham lacks only 700 of a majority. His majority over Putnam, also, in a coon skin, is 4,803, and over Chandler, coon all through, is 608! This looks like electing a coon. We prophesy that when the 2d trial comes on the Atlas will get another of its famous "snorters" from Vermont.

## DON'T GIVE UP THE SHIP! POLK, DALLAS AND VICTORY!

The democrats of Vermont have never begun to poll their strength at the Presidential elections. The vote of 1840 was a disgrace to them! The only way to keep up a party is for that party to do their best every time they have a chance to vote. One great cause of our defeat in '41 was the immense majority we allowed the coons to give in '40. The democracy said, we can't do anything against such a majority. The democrats should never have allowed such a majority to have been polled in the state. We hope the democracy of Vermont will never again disgrace themselves by allowing the Presidential election to go by default. Henry Clay can never carry a plurality in Vermont if the democrats will do their duty and poll their whole strength.

## DEATH OF LOCO POLK ANNEXATIONISM IN VERMONT.

The whigs of Vermont have achieved a most decisive victory over their adversaries of every denomination. Both Locofocoism and 3d partyism stand rebuked before the tribunal of the enlightened and patriotic freemen of the Green Mountain State.—Mid. Galaxy.

Beats all how the old Bell rattles away these days!—beats all, really.

Coon maj. in '40	10386
" " '44	1362
" loss since '40	9024
At the Presidential election in 1840, the vote was as follows:	
Van Buren 18007	
Binney 426	
Harrison 32440	
18438	18438
Coon maj. in '40	14007
" " '44	1362
" loss since '40	12645

## THIS Extraordinary triumph in Windsor County

is probably owing to Eastman's Coon Hunter of Woodstock.—Mid. Galaxy.

Coon maj. in '40	3,408
" " '44	1,367
" loss since '40	1,611
On the Presidential vote,	
Coon maj. in '40	3,984
" " '44	1,837
" loss since '40	2,097

Are your people well, Mr Galaxy?

## A GOOD BEGINNING.

In the States of Indiana, North Carolina, Louisiana, Kentucky and Illinois, the democrats have gained more than SIXTY THOUSAND votes since 1840. When we shall have received correct returns from Alabama and Missouri the Democratic gains will probably be SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND. Let the Democrats in other states do as well as their brethren have done in those states already mentioned and there is no doubt that Polk and Dallas will be elected by a much larger popular majority than Gen. Harrison received in 1840.

Iniquity somewhere.—It has been with the greatest difficulty that we have been able to get the Coon Hunter into the hands of the subscribers, during the late election, in this state. In one town, in Franklin co., not a copy was seen for three weeks till the night before the election. Then the three bundles made their appearance in one mail, safe and sound! Complaints from all parts of the state have reached us. All we can say, is, that the Coon Hunter is regularly mailed, every week, and if they do not reach their place of destination, the coons steal them. Our friends must bear this grievance till the 4th of March next, when the miserable varnishes who infest our public offices will be skinned.

## GREAT FUN.

We see that some of the coon papers in this state are publishing Clay's letter to John M. Clayton, dated Blue Licks, Aug. 22, 1844.

The poor critters didn't know that the letter contained the following abominable Locofoco doctrine:

"EVERYWHERE THE CRY IS FOR A TARIFF FOR REVENUE, WITH DISCRIMINATIONS FOR PROTECTION."

The "fix" the old varmint is in, these days, is truly pitiable.

## HARVEY BELL ESQ.

Will you have the kindness to publish in your paper Mr Clay's last letter on the Texas question. By so doing you will greatly oblige many of your subscribers. Please print the following extract from that letter, thus:

"I have, however, no hesitation in saying that, far from having any personal objection to the annexation of Texas, I should be glad to see it, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms. I DO NOT THINK THAT THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY OUGHT TO AFFECT THE QUESTION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. Whether Texas be independent or incorporated in the United States, I do not believe it will prolong or shorten the duration of that institution. It is destined to become extinct, at some distant day, in my opinion, by the operation of the inevitable laws of population. It would be unwise to refuse a permanent acquisition, which will exist as long as the globe remains, on account of a temporary institution."

EYES LEFT.

## CLAY'S "LATEST" LETTER IN CINCINNATI.

The Cincinnati Enquirer thus speaks of the effect of the "latest" letter of Mr Clay on the coons in Cincinnati. The effect has been the same in every county from which we have received intelligence. In this city, it was really curious to observe the workings of coonery while reading it. It was truly awful:

## "PERSONALLY" FOR ANNEXATION.

A bomb-shell thrown into the Camp of a sleeping soldiery could not create more confusion and alarm than has Clay's last letter, for annexation, and repudiating his first, among the whigs of this city.—We have heard of several and seen others, utterly denying its genuineness, and pronouncing it a "vile trick—a locofoco forgery." One zealous whig, with a fearful oath, denounced it as a slander upon Mr Clay, and declared upon his soul that if it were GENUINE he would not vote him! All about the city it was the talk on Saturday, and because the Gazette and Atlas and Chronicle, Mr Clay's partisan anti-Texas organs, had studiously kept it from their columns, the circumstance was to many a strong assurance that the letter was a forgery. Will these papers publish the letter? Will they do it soon? Will they give us their opinions of Texas now?—Ohio Statesman.

We copy from the Boston Times the following pathetic lamentation of the dying coon, upon hearing the result of the election in Maine. It is really quite affecting. Who's got a Clay handkerchief?

## THE DYING COON.

—Ain't—Ain't's Daughter?  
"Farewell to thee, land of the coon's, without slaughter,  
Thou wert a coon who was slaughtered in Maine,  
Thou knowest you have done by us as we can't suffer,  
And the way we once came in, we can't come again."

"I feel the sharp knife after my first hide pring,  
I feel the sharp point in my very heart's core,  
I feel how my dear friends I feel that I am going,  
And shortly the coon will be heard of no more."

"Oh! give me respects to our darling old Harry,  
Convince him to give up his mischief and doze,  
And then die with peace—the State he has nursed,  
But sure as I am dashed—the 'emphatic' dies."

## "WHO IS JIMMY K. POLK?"

A democratic speaker in Vevay, Indiana, was interrupted by a two legged coon, inquiring, "pray, sir, can you tell me who this Jimmy K. Polk is?" The democrat responded, "He is the man that in 1843 got more votes for Governor of Tennessee, than Henry Clay received in 1824 in the whole Union for President."

The coon sloped, and has not been heard of since that time.

The coons have succeeded in sneezing in their candidate by selecting an out-and-out abolitionist by a little more than 1090 majority! Great, that! If Clay's last letter on annexation had got wind in Vermont before the election, Slade would have been defeated by 5,000 votes.

## SIT DOWN

And read over Mr Wright's Speech and then raise a dollar or two among the brethren and order a lot to give to your coon friends. There is no getting away from the speech.

Don't fail to see it well distributed in the state.

Cassius M. Clay on the Annexation of Texas.—Cassius Marcellus Clay, nephew of the gallant Harry, pretends to be most zealous for the coon cause on account of its hostility to the re-annexation of Texas, and yet the journals of the Kentucky Legislature show that at the session of 1837—3 this same Cassius introduced a series of resolutions into that body, urging the very measure which he now opposes. They were ten in number, a portion of them as follows:

"Resolved, That we avow the right of two or more independent nations to unite themselves under one government for their mutual protection and happiness, and that union is in accordance with the laws of nature and nations.

That Texas, being in possession of the territory claimed by her, and in a state of quietude, and under an organized government, is, and of right ought to be, an independent nation.

That the power to receive, 'new states' into this Union, is expressly granted by the Constitution of the United States, and in accordance with the practice of our government.

That the admission of 'new states' into our Union has realized the anticipations of the most sanguine, and added increased strength and splendor to our Federal Government.

That a confederated representative government, like that of the United States, is suited to an indefinite space and population, and that experience warrants us in the assertion that a whole continent is not too large for useful action.

That the admission of Texas into this Union is expedient and desirable, thereby diminishing the expenses of peace, and lessening the chances of war—giving us wealth and population at home, and elevating us among foreign nations."

A copy of these resolutions were sent to the delegation in Congress.

Such were the sentiments of Cassius M. Clay in 1838. If they were correct then why has he abandoned them now? Only because "my uncle" committed himself against annexation in his unfortunate Raleigh letter!

"GLORIOUS OLD ADDISON CO."—Mid. Galaxy.

Coon maj. in '40	1,666
" " '44	1,206
Coon loss since '40	460

Cool, decidedly—the way our exchange papers have appropriated our election returns, this year.

## HERE YOU HAVE IT BOYS!—CLAY'S OPINIONS ON THE TEXAS QUESTION! READ! READ! WHERE WILL THE VERMONT COONS HIDE AFTER THIS? OH-HUM!

From the Tusculum, North Abolition of August 16, and the Ohio State Journal of August 27, 1844.

ASHLAND, 27th July, 1844.

GENTLEMEN—I have received your favor informing me, that my views, as disclosed in my letter from Raleigh, on the question of the Annexation of Texas, are misconceived, if not misrepresented, in your quarter; and that it is supposed that I have changed my opinion from what it was in 1819. I endeavored to express myself in that letter as explicitly as I could, and I do not think now that it can be fairly misinterpreted.

In 1819, when I addressed the House of Representatives, the Executive had negotiated the treaty with Spain, by which Texas was ceded to that power, but Congress had not then given any sanction to the cession. I believe now, and I thought then, that the treaty making power is not competent without the concurrence of Congress, to cede away any territory belonging to the United States. But Congress by repeated acts, subsequently manifested its approbation of the treaty; and these acts rendered it as valid and obligatory upon the United States as if Congress had given its assent, prior to the conclusion of the treaty. At that period of 1819, Texas was claimed by us, was unpeopled. No hostile incursions had been made into it by the citizens of the United States. In 1825, and 1827, there were but few inhabitants of Texas, consisting of some colonists planted there under the authority of Mexico.

At neither of the three periods above mentioned had any State or section, in this Union, manifested any opposition to Texas as composing a part of it. It has been said that Mr Adams' administration offered to negotiate with Mexico for Texas, notwithstanding the existence of a war between Spain and Mexico, and that it could not therefore have believed that the acquisition of Texas, at that time, would have involved the United States in a war with Spain. Hence it is argued that the ratification of the late treaty could not have compromised our peace.

Mr Adams thought it desirable to obtain Texas. Two foreign powers claimed it. Mexico was in possession, and Spain was doing nothing to assert and enforce her claim. Her representative had even gone so far as to stipulate, in a convention, to acknowledge the Independence of Mexico, although that convention was not ratified by Spain.

MR ADAMS HAD A RIGHT TO AUTHORITY THE NEGOTIATION OF A TREATY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF TEXAS WITH BOTH OR EITHER OF THE POWERS CLAIMING IT. IT WAS NATURAL THAT HE SHOULD BEGIN WITH THAT POWER WHICH HAD THE POSSESSION OF TEXAS. Spain had interposed no obstacle, she had made no declaration that she would regard the acquisition of Texas as an act of war. In point of fact, no overt act was formally made to Mexico to purchase Texas, no negotiation was opened, no treaty was concluded. If a negotiation had commenced, or if a treaty had been signed, and Spain had protested, the prudent and cautious policy which characterized Mr Adams' administration, would undoubtedly have prompted him to quiet Spain, and accommodate the matter, previous to the annexation of Texas to the United States and without plunging them in war with Spain. How totally different are all the circumstances under which with Mr Adams' authority, I authorized the overture to Mexico, from those which attended the recent treaty of Mr Tyler!

So far from Mexico being silent she repeatedly and solemnly declared that she would consider annexation as war with her. Texas was no longer an uninhabited country. It had been wrested from the dominion of Mexico by citizens, many of whom went armed from the U. States.—The war between Mexico and Texas had not been terminated by any treaty of peace. Mr Tyler not only did not consult Mexico, but he announced that assent to the annexation was altogether unnecessary, as he proceeded to conclude a treaty, embracing a large extent of Territory, and a numerous population, not comprehended in the Texas which the U. States ceded to Spain in 1819.

In the meantime, too, a powerful opposition had arisen in the United States against the annexation of Texas to them.—Several States had declared through their Legislatures, against it, and others, if not whole sections of the Union, were believed to be adverse to it. This was the opposition to the measure, to which, in my Raleigh letter, I alluded, when I spoke of a considerable and respectable portion of the "confederacy." I did not refer to persons but to States or sections.

Under such circumstances I could not but regard the Annexation of Texas, at this time, as compromising the honor of my country, involving it in a war, in which the sympathies of all Christendom would be against us, and endangering the integrity of the Union. I thought then, and still believe, that National dishonor, foreign war, and distraction and division at home were too great sacrifices to make for the acquisition of Texas.

But, gentlemen, you are desirous of knowing by what policy I would be guided in the event of my election as chief Magistrate of the United States, in reference to the question of the annexation of Texas. I do not think it right to announce in advance what will be the course of a future administration in respect to a question with a foreign power. I have, however, no hesitation in saying that, far from having any personal objection to the annexation of Texas, I should be glad to see it, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms. I do not think that the subject of Slavery ought to affect the question one way or the other. Whether Texas be INDEPENDENT or INCORPORATED in the UNITED STATES, I do not believe it will prolong or shorten the duration of that institution. It is destined to become extinct, at some distant day, in